## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-8, 10, 14, 16, 18, 19, and 23 are currently amended. New claims 31 and 32 have been added. Claim 9 has been canceled. Claims 12-13, 21, and 27-30 have been withdrawn due to the Restriction Requirement.

New matter is not being introduced in the application by way of this amendment. The amendment to claim 1 is supported, for example, at page 25, line 18 of the present specification. The amendment to claim 8 is supported for example at page 29 of the present specification. New claim 31 is supported for example at page 34 of the present specification. New claim 32 is supported, for example, at page 36 of the present specification. Accordingly, entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

## Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-11, 14-20, and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as indefinite.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims as currently amended render this rejection moot. It is further submitted that this amendment does not narrow the scope of the claims, but only further clarifies the subject matter of the claims. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 1-5, 8-11, 14-20 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Willems et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,194,497). Claims 1-11, 14-20, and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Hilti et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,814,688); Helms et al. (U.S.

Docket No.: 2927-0166P

Application No. 10/756,414

Amendment dated November 7, 2005

Reply to Office Action of June 6, 2005

Page 13

Patent No. 5,959,015); and Wada et al. (JP 01178554). For the following reasons, each of these

rejections is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 as presently amended recites a polymer composition that contains "a polyether

block polyolefin copolymer." It is respectfully suggested that this limitation is nowhere disclosed

by any of the cited prior art references.

Willem discloses anti-static compositions with a thermoplastic resin, and a fluorinated

phosphonium sulfonate. Willem expressly recites that the fluorinated sulfonate has an organic

phosphonium cation. See Willems, col. 3, lines 36-37. Willems mentions various polymers that

can be used with their invention at col. 3, lines 5-8. However, Willems does not mention

polymers with a polyether block polyolefin copolymer as recited in the present claims. Willems

does not teach or suggest the present invention. It is respectfully suggested that in light of the

present claim amendments, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Helms discloses conductive polymeric materials, combined with an alkali metal salt. See

Helms Abstract. However, Helms does not disclose or suggest "a polyether block polyolefin

copolymer" as recited in present claim 1. Helms does not disclose using the polymers of the

present claims. It is respectfully suggested that in light of the present claim amendments, this

rejection should now be withdrawn.

Hilti discloses a polar inorganic or organic material to which an anti-static agent is bound

"adsorptively." Hilti, col. 8, lines 33-34. The present claim 1 recites that the salt is added

dispersedly in the polymer composition. Hilti does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed

invention. It is respectfully suggested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Application No. 10/756,414

Amendment dated November 7, 2005

Reply to Office Action of June 6, 2005

Page 14

JP 01178554 mentions compositions which include a thermoplastic resin with a

Docket No.: 2927-0166P

polyether-ester-amide elastomer, and a fluoroalkyl metal salt. However JP 01178554 does not

disclose or suggest use of the presently claimed polymers. JP 01178554 does not mention

polymers with a polyether block polyolefin copolymer as recited in the present claims. It is

respectfully suggested that in light of the present claim amendments, this rejection should now

be withdrawn. Accordingly, It is respectfully submitted that the claims are now allowable.

Conclusion

If any questions arise regarding the above matters, please contact Applicant's

representative, Andrew D. Meikle (Reg. No. 32,868), in the Washington Metropolitan Area at

the phone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to

charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional

fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time

fees.

Dated: November 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew D. Meikle

Registration No.: 32,868

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

1-in/K